



Case Number:	Cause 285 of 2018
Date Delivered:	21 Jan 2022
Case Class:	Civil
Court:	Environment and Land Court at Kisumu
Case Action:	Judgment
Judge:	Christine Noontatua Baari
Citation:	Kenya Hotels and Allied Workers Union v Ritz Garden Hotel & another [2022] eKLR
Advocates:	Mr. Eric Ngame present for the Claimant Mr. George Opande 2nd Respondent present in person
Case Summary:	-
Court Division:	Employment and Labour Relations
History Magistrates:	-
County:	Kisumu
Docket Number:	-
History Docket Number:	-
Case Outcome:	Claimant awarded
History County:	-
Representation By Advocates:	Both Parties Represented
Advocates For:	-
Advocates Against:	-
Sum Awarded:	-

The information contained in the above segment is not part of the judicial opinion delivered by the Court. The metadata has been prepared by Kenya Law as a guide in understanding the subject of the judicial opinion. Kenya Law makes no warranties as to the comprehensiveness or accuracy of the information.

**REPUBLIC OF KENYA**

**IN THE EMPLOYMENT AND LABOUR RELATIONS COURT**

**AT KISUMU**

**CAUSE NO. 285 OF 2018**

**KENYA HOTELS AND ALLIED WORKERS UNION.....CLAIMANT**

**VERSUS**

**RITZ GARDEN HOTEL.....1<sup>ST</sup> RESPONDENT**

**GEORGE OPANDE.....2<sup>ND</sup> RESPONDENT**

**JUDGMENT**

**Introduction**

1. By a Memorandum of Claim dated 27<sup>th</sup> August, 2018 and filed in court on 28<sup>th</sup> August, 2018, the Claimant sought payment of one-month salary in lieu of notice, one year of unpaid leave, 9 days salary for holidays worked, salary for 17 days worked, under payments and 12 months' salary in compensation for unfair termination.
2. The 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent filed a Response to the claim on 13<sup>th</sup> September, 2018, wherein, he wholly denied the Claimant's claim.
3. The Claimant presented two witnesses during hearing, one being the grievant in the matter, Mr. Elisha Ochieng and Harrizone Owuor Andoke, the grievant's former co-worker and also a one-time chef of the Respondents to testify on their behalf.
4. The 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent testified in opposition to the Claimant's claim.
5. The witnesses adopted their witness statements and produced their bundle of documents filed in evidence before court.
6. Parties did not file submissions in the matter.

**The Claimant's Case**

7. Mr. Elisha Ochieng testifying for the Claimant, stated that he was employed by the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent to work at the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent, which was a hotel owned by him where he served as a waiter for one year and two months.
8. It is his case that the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent employed him on 30<sup>th</sup> December, 2014, after consultation on the terms of employment. It is his case that he was not given a written employment contract but that he diligently served the Respondent under terms agreed upon verbally. It is his further case that he was paid in cash and was never given a pay slip through out his time in the service of the Respondents.
9. The Claimant states that he was terminated on 17<sup>th</sup> February, 2016. The Claimant further avers that the Respondents deducted but never remitted his NSSF contribution. He further avers that he joined the Claimant union on 8<sup>th</sup> October, 2015 and that he personally paid union dues to the Claimant.
10. Mr. Ochieng stated on cross examination, that contrary to the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondents averment denying being the owner of the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent, that he knows the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent operated the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent, where he doubled up as a Director and the Manager of the hotel. He further avers that the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent employed staff for the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent and was fully in charge of its daily

operations.

11. Mr. Harrizone Owuor Andoke's testimony, is that he was the grievant's co-worker at the Respondents hotel where he served as a chef between the year 2013 to 2019. He further states that he knows the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent as the Director of the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent and that he was his employer.

12. It is Mr. Andoke's testimony that just like the grievant, he was never given a written contract of employment, but that he served the Respondents under a verbal agreement. He states that the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent wrote him a recommendation letter which was to assist him secure alternative employment when the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent converted the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent to rental houses.

### **The Respondents' Case**

13. It is the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent's case that he does not know the two witnesses who testified in the matter. He states that he did not employ the grievant and that the letter of recommendation produced in court by Mr. Andoke was not issued by him and hence it is a work of forgery.

14. The 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent denies being the owner of the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent and avers that he was wrongly sued in this matter. He states that he did not issue the grievant with a letter of employment because he was not his employee.

15. The Respondent states that he only met the grievant in court for the first time. It is his case that he is not in breach of any contract of employment as he did not issue any. He further states that there is nothing connecting him to the grievant and by extension the Claimant.

### **Determination**

16. The court identified the following as issues for determination in this matter:

- i. Whether the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent is/was the owner or operated the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent
- ii. Whether the Claimant/grievant was unfairly terminated
- iii. Whether the Claimant is entitled to the reliefs sought.
- iv. Who bears the costs of the suit.

### **Whether the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent is/was the owner or operated the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent**

17. The 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent denies knowing the grievant in this matter. He also denies being the owner of the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent hotel. The Claimant's witnesses confirmed having been recruited and employed by the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent to work at the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent hotel that was operated by the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent.

18. The Claimant's witness number two, Mr. Harrizone Owuor Andoke, corroborated the evidence of the Claimant's first witness who is also the grievant in this matter, Mr. Elisha Ochieng. It was Mr. Andoke's testimony that he together with the grievant, were in the service of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent. He produced a letter of recommendation written for him by the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent to enable him secure alternative employment when he converted his hotel to rental houses.

19. In the opinion of this court, the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent's evidence is a mere denial of his relationship with the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent, as well as the employment relationship that existed between him and the two witnesses in this matter. Both of the Claimant's witnesses described him as someone they knew well and who they worked for.

20. The 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent did not produce registration documents and/or business licenses to disassociate himself with the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent. His evidence is a bare denial of the Claimant's case and smirks of dishonesty.

21. I find and hold that the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent is the owner/Director of the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent.

**Whether the Claimant/grievant was unfairly terminated**

22. By denying being the employer of the grievant when it is evident from the testimony of the two witness that he was their employer, the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent denied himself an opportunity to disapprove the Claimant's claim. He did not address himself to the issue of unfair termination raised by the Claimant in this matter and neither did he answer or oppose the reliefs that the Claimant seeks herein.

23. The witnesses confirmed to this court that the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent habitually engaged employees without giving them letters of appointment, in a bid to avoid the obligations that come with employing workers in his business.

24. The 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent wrote a letter of recommendation for the Claimant's witness number two Mr. Andoke, using the letter head of the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent and further signed of as the Managing Director of the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent. There is no denying that indeed the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent operated the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent where he employed the Claimant's witnesses/grievant.

25. The court finds and holds that in the absence of evidence to the contrary, the grievant herein was unfairly terminated.

**Whether the Claimant is entitled to the reliefs sought**

26. The 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent did not address himself or oppose the reliefs sought herein. The 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent did not issue appointment letters and pay slips or pay advise to the grievant which is his obligation to do as an employer.

27. The Claimant had no other way of proving that he was not paid and neither has the Respondent, as the employer proved that he paid the Claimant.

28. The court finds and holds that the Claimant is entitled to the reliefs sought in his statement of claim and are hereby awarded as per claim.

29. In Conclusion, judgment is entered for the Claimant against the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent as follows:

- i. One-month salary in lieu of notice at Kshs. 11,831/=
- ii. Pay in lieu of leave at Kshs. 9,465/=
- iii. 9 days of unpaid public holidays at Kshs. 3,549/=
- iv. 17 days worked in February, 2016 at Kshs. 6,704/=
- v. Salary under payment at Kshs. 73,550/=
- vi. 4 months' salary as compensation for unfair termination at Kshs. 47,324/=
- vii. Costs of the suit and interest until payment in full.

30. Judgment accordingly.

**SIGNED, DATED AND DELIVERED BY VIDEO-LINK AND IN COURT AT KISUMU THIS 21<sup>ST</sup> DAY OF JANUARY, 2022.**

**CHRISTINE N. BAARI**

**JUDGE**

**APPEARANCE:**

**MR. ERIC NGAME PRESENT FOR THE CLAIMANT**

**MR. GEORGE OPANDE 2ND RESPONDENT PRESENT IN PERSON**

**MS. CHRISTINE OMOLLO- C/A**



While the design, structure and metadata of the Case Search database are licensed by [Kenya Law](#) under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International](#), the texts of the judicial opinions contained in it are in the [public domain](#) and are free from any copyright restrictions. Read our [Privacy Policy](#) | [Disclaimer](#)